

# POLITICAL NOTES

Vol 2 No 7 - 5¢

Group of Revolutionary Marxists

Sept. 1, 1946

## YANKEE IMPERIALISM "ARRIVES" IN CHINA

China's continuing civil war has reached such a pitch that Mme. Sun Yat-Sen, widow of the famous Chinese bourgeois revolutionist, came out of semi-retirement to blast the policies of the imperialist U.S. and of the dictatorial Kuomintang regime headed by her brother-in-law Chiang-Kai-Shek.

"The first flame of a world conflagration is burning in our land", she said. "It must be quenched lest the fire destroy the world."

"Madame Sun called upon both sides to end the warfare and organize a coalition government. She said reactionaries in the Kuomintang are inflaming the nation to civil war, which they can not win, 'because they hope the conflict will incite war between America and Russia and thus at last crush the Chinese Communists'.

"The American people who are the allies and long friends of China, must clearly be told this road to disaster", she said. "They must be told that American reactionaries are teaming up with Chinese reactionaries, each encouraging the other.

"They must be told that the presence of United States armed forces on Chinese soil is not strengthening peace and order among the Chinese people. They must be warned that if America makes it plain that she will not supply munitions or military assistance, there will be no spreading of the Chinese civil war". (AP, Chicago Tribune, July 23, 1946)

Since V-J day, the U.S. under its lend-lease program has shipped more military aid to the Chiang-kai-shek government than during the whole course of the war. The officially stated reason for this was the necessity of "liberating" the Japanese-held portions of China and sending the Japanese armed forces back to Japan. The actual purpose and results of the U.S.' sudden liberality was to bolster up Chiang's tottering dictatorship and assure that the control of China remained in the hands of the capitalists and landlords who make up the Kuomintang government.

This "Operation Nursemaid" on behalf of Chiang's dictatorship has involved the use of US marines to guard railroads, the use of the US Navy and Air Force to transport Chiang's troops northward, the use of Japanese troops (the official enemy) to crush down the so-called Communists, and Marshall's hypocritical pretense of being an "impartial" arbiter of China's civil war.

These facts are widely known and have occasioned many protests in the US. The general justification offered for all these acts of US intervention in China's civil war is that the Chiang-kai-shek government is the "only recognized government" in China. As though

Page 2-----FN  
in some mysterious manner recognition accorded by the high priests of the State Department absolves Chiang's government of all sin and makes it the duty of the US to finance, arm, and defend this rotten dictatorship against all comers.

But this does not answer the question; what business does the US have intervening in China? As a matter of fact it begs the question--or rather, two questions. First, what sort of government is it which Roosevelt, Truman, Hull and Byrnes have designated as "the only recognized Chinese government"? And second, since there are two governments existing in China, why has the US picked this particular one to recognize? What is the US getting out of it?

We analyzed the character of Chiang's regime in POLITICAL NOTES Vol.1, No. 3, issued August 6, 1945: "It is also good to remember what Edgar Snow stated in PEOPLE ON OUR SIDE: 'The peculiar composition of this party-government represents primarily the greater landlord class and the compradore group of neo-capitalists with their heavy banking and industrial investments in Eastern China and America. The Generalissimo himself now officially ranks as the foremost banker of China. With his immensely rich brother-in-law and sister-in-law Dr. and Mme. Kung and their children the wealthy Mme. Chiang Soong Mei-ling, and her brothers, he holds today the key positions in all private and government finance groups. Incidentally, as far as is publicly known, no member of the Chiang-Kung-Soong family has ever filed a personal income tax report.'....

"To understand the alliance of the Chinese bourgeoisie with the feudal land-owners on one hand and the imperialists on the other is to understand the nature of the struggle. China's 450 million are mainly peasants (there are estimated to be about 15 million proletarians and semi-proletarians) and for them the solution to the agrarian problem is primary.

"They exist in the most abject poverty, exploited mercilessly by landowner, magistrate, usurer and tax collector who are in many localities the same person. They squirm under a system of oppression which squeezes out every drop of their vitality even to the extent of extorting taxes sixty years in advance. These masses, therefore, constitute a highly inflammable material which a revolutionary spark could ignite into an uncontrollable inferno. The support given to the Red Army and partisans, even in the rear of the Japanese occupiers, demonstrates the intense desire of the peasantry to free itself from all oppressors--both foreign and domestic. Cognizance of this danger is the foundation policy of the Kuomintang and the attempt to isolate and squelch the revolutionary struggle of the masses, the core of its strategy."

An excellent example of the functioning of this government of a family of bankers is provided by the recent blow-up over the handling of "relief" sent in by the UNRRA. It appears, for example, that UNRRA shipped to China 36 air-conditioning units for use in the skin disease wards of Chinese hospitals. So far as is known, none ever reached a hospital. However, three did reach T. V. Soong, member of the Chiang-Kung-Soong banking family and China's Premier.

PN-----Page 3  
One has been installed in his office and one each in two of his houses. Need we add that Soong has never been reported as suffering from skin disease?

The documented UNRRA report on the fate of the rest of these air-conditioning units is summarized by the CHICAGO SUN (July 11) as follows: "...two units have been reported traced by UNRRA investigators to the Park Hotel in Shanghai, six to 'local allocations', seven to the secretary of the executive Yuan, eight to the Asia Development Corp., and four to Telegraph Communications."

By official agreement, all UNRRA supplies are turned over at the docks to the Chinese National Relief and Rehabilitation Administration--an agency set up by Chiang's government. The CNRRA was supposed to receive \$172,000,000 (US) from the Chinese government to meet the cost of distribution. To date even this bourgeois administrative organization, the CNRRA, has not received one penny of this money. Instead it sells 90% of the relief goods it receives. (Technically, the UNRRA-CNRRA agreement provides only 10% of the relief goods delivered should be sold by CN). The result of the government's refusal to advance CN any money has been to insure that it becomes nothing but a tremendous racket, providing easy pickings for government officials and the rich and no relief for the poor. Premier Soong--in his now delightfully air-conditioned office--apparently sees no need of relief for China's starving millions.

Madame Sun Yat-sen's appeal for national unity of all classes under a coalition government is nothing but a pipe-dream, a repetition of the national unity plank of Sun-Yat-Sen's program which it is impossible to carry out in this period of decay capitalism. The question is not one of a possible coalition government. The question today can only be which classes will rule: either an alliance of Chinese capitalists and US imperialists will rule China, or an alliance of Chinese workers and peasants will rule through establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. There are no other alternatives.

The US imperialists know this. They are backing the rotten, corrupt Chinese government to the hilt. Money, Marines, "relief" supplies are all directed to the one aim of keeping Chiang's tottering regime in the saddle. For through Chiang's regime, the US imperialists plan to get exclusive rights to exploit China's vast market for goods and capital. Marshall's gymnastics, talk of a truce, coalition government, exporting Japanese soldiers, guarding railway lines, etc., are primarily eye-wash to cover up US intervention and keep the American and Chinese masses befuddled and quiet.

The use of relief supplies by the capitalist cliques supporting the government is portrayed by the newspapers as simple graft and corruption. It is more than that. UNRRA is a shot in the arm--a subsidy--to the Chinese capitalist class, providing it with goods very difficult to get in China on which it can realize astronomical profits according to the time-honored principles of "free enterprise"--i.e. speculation. This subsidizing has been going on for months. It went unquestioned until a technical difficulty developed: The Shanghai docks became so jammed with goods it was impossible to unload any more.

The relief supplies which escape diversion into private hands are openly used by Chiang as weapons in the struggle against the "Communists". The head of CNRRA is a Dr. Tsiang. He received a good capitalist education in the US, graduating from Oberlin and from Columbia University. And he is not influenced one bit by any loose talk about "unity" and "peace"--from Marshall or anyone else. Not one item of the relief goods he handles has been allowed to go to "communist-controlled" areas.

UNRRA is committed to deliver \$662 million (US) of goods to CNRRA. "Of this amount, \$535,000,000 is in goods including heavy industrial equipment, locomotives, bridges, trucks, shelters, rails and the like. Of this sort of equipment, according to Tsiang, 'The Communists get none'.

"The food, says Tsiang, the Communists do not need since 'They are in control of the food growing areas and don't want food. We even buy food from them in exchange for medical supplies which they do need.'" (Chicago Sun, July 10, 1946, our emphasis)

Could anything be clearer than that? The only items of relief supplies allowed out of government-controlled areas are those medical supplies which Tsiang finds it expedient to sell in return for food. And US knows this and needs UNRRA to help its imperialist policy. The main support of the Chinese bourgeoisie is American Imperialism.

It is the duty of American workers to force the withdrawal of American troops from China, to stop by strikes and demonstrations the flow of materials to Chiang-kai-shek's armies. We must support the Chinese social revolution and help it in every way we can for reasons of pure self interest. Through a huge military machine supported by heavy taxes and through the continued drafting of American workers, US imperialism plans to take over China. Needless to say, the workers of the US will be the ones to foot the bill and to do the suffering and dying in China. Nor is it a matter of merely one or two years duration. Support of the decaying, rotten, corrupt regime of the Chinese bourgeoisie will call for ever more men and war materials to keep China's 400 million oppressed masses in subjection. The American working class must either accept the perspective of fighting a long-drawn-out war with the Chinese peasant guerillas for the benefit of Wall Street or it must organize itself in effective struggle under the slogans of : "Not one man, not one cent, not one gun for Chiang's dictatorship! Return American troops to the US! Long live the Chinese Social revolution!"

## PEASANT WAR IN NORTH CHINA

The feudal landlords and compradore bourgeoisie of China and the imperialist bankers and "statesmen" of the US have allied themselves against the so-called "communist" regime in the north of China. Actually this regime is not communist in the accepted Marxist sense of the word. The government and movement which has its center in Yanan is in reality a peasant movement to redistribute the land. The con-

PN-----Page 5  
ditions of the Chinese peasantry are so oppressive, the contradictions of the semi-feudal system of agriculture so sharp, that for the last 20 years the red flag of peasant revolt has continuously waved over a revolutionary peasant army in some part of China. This is a fundamental and important point. Let us stress it again. The "Communist" armies and government of the northern provinces are not the product of a political party or the reflection of ideas imported from Russia or read in a book. This regime and these armies are the product of the objective conditions in China. They exist and have existed, in one form or another, for the last twenty years. They are the direct result of the breakdown of semi-feudal Chinese agriculture.

At the head of this revolutionary peasant movement stand reformist politicians who give political allegiance to Stalinism. The political program of these gentry calls for redivision of the land on the one hand and collaboration with capitalism on the other (protection of private property, etc.). Essentially this is a bourgeois-democratic platform.

It is important to keep firmly fixed in mind these two elements of the Yen-an regime--the mass movement of the peasantry at the bottom and the reformist politicians at the top. For if one tries to explain it purely as a reformist political movement or, on the other hand, purely as a mass revolutionary movement, one's tactics and strategy will be all out of line with the complex objective reality which exists.

An understanding of the composition of the Yen-an regime at once gives an explanation of both its weakness and its strength.

Its essential weakness flows from the fact that the Chinese working class is not acting as the leader in the agrarian revolution which the Yen-an movement is trying to accomplish. History has proven again and again, from the time of the Middle Ages onward, that the peasantry cannot accomplish a successful agrarian revolution and consolidate its gains without leadership from the cities. In France the revolutionary bourgeoisie of 1793 made an alliance with the peasantry and together they overthrew the feudal aristocracy and consolidated the bourgeois revolution in both town and country. China has never had such a bourgeois revolution and it is now impossible for one to develop in that country. The Chinese bourgeoisie--developing in the imperialist (decay) stage of capitalism--can reach no higher stage than that of a compradore bourgeoisie, depending primarily on foreign imperialist powers for its strength. The Chinese bourgeoisie is so weak and in so many contradictions, so tied up with feudal land-holding interests and with foreign capital, that it cannot take the leadership of the peasant masses and carry through the agrarian revolution. This was proven in life by the Chinese revolution of 1925-27. So soon as it was successful in achieving the unification of the country, the Chinese bourgeoisie, with Chiang-kai-shek at their head, slaughtered the revolutionary elements of the working class, declared open war on the revolutionary peasant movement and made a deal with the feudal land-holding class and the foreign imperialists..

The only class which can lead a successful revolution is the working class. The Chinese land problem and the final liquidation of feudal hangovers can only be solved as the agrarian phase of a proletarian social revolution. Only the overthrow of the Chinese bourgeoisie by the Chinese working class and the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship based on the toiling masses of the large towns and cities as well as the oppressed peasantry can bring to a successful conclusion the 20-year long peasant war which has been raging in China. It is precisely in refusing to carry out such a revolutionary line that the reformist stalinist leadership of the Yen-an regime betrays the struggle. After twenty long years of continuous armed struggle, these reformist traitors still send delegates to negotiate with Chiang-kai-shek. They still try to set up together with him a joint government and promise that if a "democratic" constituent assembly is chosen they will liquidate their armed forces and accept the discipline of the bourgeois military generals. And within the areas they control, they concentrate purely on land reform and do not socialize the industry of the towns under their control. Obviously, these treacherous reformist "Communist" leaders will never make the social revolution and will in all probability work against and actively oppose revolutionary uprisings of the city proletariat. They must be fought as a hostile and essentially bourgeois political tendency.

At first glance, it is surprising that with such treacherous non-revolutionary leadership, the peasant movement has survived twenty long years of struggle against the landlords and the bourgeoisie and still is in control of considerable regions in China. To understand the strength of this movement, a closer inspection of the Chinese land question is necessary.

LANDLORD AND PEASANT IN CHINA, a Study of the Agrarian Crisis in South China, by Chen Han-Seng, published in 1936, portrays the decay of the Chinese feudal system of agriculture under the impact of world capitalism. This valuable work is based on detailed studies made in 1933 and 1934 in Kwangtung Province, particularly the section near Canton.

The dominant feudal form remaining in Chinese agriculture in this section is the clan or family-corporation form of landholding. Originally, lands were set aside by the different clans and sub-clans, the income of which was devoted to maintaining ancestral temples, stipends for student and scholar members of the clan, grants of rice to members over 60 years old, help to poorer members for wedding and funeral ceremonies, and relief in times of severe famine. Clan lands cannot be sold unless by common consent of all of the elders. This provision together with the steady reinvestment of income in more land has resulted in the clans owning from 25 to 50% in the various sections of Kwangtung province with a figure of 35% of the cultivated land for the province as a whole. They thus constitute the dominating power in the country-side.

With the advent of capitalist relations in China--the sale of agricultural produce rather than its use for home consumption, investment of capital in trade and industry, growth of cash rents in-

PN: -----Page 7  
stead of rents and taxes in kind--these clans have lost their character as family religious organizations and have been transformed into corporate-landholding devices through which the richer landholders exploit the toiling mass of the peasantry.

"...The clan managers, the clan treasurers, and the clan chief-accountants are the ones who exercise real power. Men of real power are elected to their offices...are supposed to be 'rich and reliable', 'learned' and 'rational'...Nominally, the clan\*--consisting mostly of fish pond rent, house rent, land rent and interest on clan loans--come under the management and control of the clan treasurer or the accountant...Often some of the rent from clan land is used to pay the land tax of the private families in control of the clan finances. Thus, notwithstanding that the clan land cannot be freely disposed of, the clan income is in reality at the free disposal of the clan officer...The vast sum of clan incomes...is quietly passing into the possession of a relatively few people." (Opus cit. pages 37 and 38)

In addition to being corporate landlords, these clans play the role of money-lenders (at exceedingly high rates.) Clan members must pay rent for the use of clan land and, as indicated, the only ones to benefit by the clan organization are the wealthy families who control the corporate income.

The class of rich peasants which benefits from these clans is only a tiny minority. "The rich peasants, constituting less than one eighth of the families, have the use of one third of the cultivated land. At the other extreme, little more than another third is all the land which the poor peasants have at their disposal, although they and their families make up two-thirds of the peasant population." (Op. cit. page 11.)

Fifty-two per cent of the peasant population is completely landless but this figure must be understood in the light of the peculiar agricultural conditions existing in China. Being landless does not necessarily mean being poor, provided a family has the wherewithal to rent land and hire labor. A study of ten representative villages in 1933 showed that 17.8% of the rich peasants, 26.9% of the middle peasants, and 60.4% of the poor peasants were landless. Only the agricultural laborers (about 10% of the population) were completely landless. With about 40% of the poor peasants owning some land--even if it isn't enough to live on--and taking into account the deep-seated desire for land-ownership which exists in every peasant class, one can understand why the Chinese peasant Soviets were organized under the slogan of "Pay no rents, no taxes, no interest" rather than under the slogans of expropriation of landlords and nationalization of land.

In Kwangtung province, the rent for land ranges from 40 to 65 per cent of the crop. Taxes are passed on to the tenants by the landlords so that as much as 80% of the tenant's crop in some sections goes for rent and taxes.

Under the pretext of establishing local self-rule, the Kuoming\*treasurer or clan chief-accountant holds his office for one year, but he may be re-appointed year after year...All incomes of the clan

tang regime has turned the political power in the villages over to the local clan officers, landlords and money-lenders. Consequently, the village ruling class has a monopoly of the political and police power in its hands to enforce its extreme exploitation of the masses.

It is these conditions, made continually worse by economic crises, higher and higher taxes and levies for war purposes, and the boundless greed of the Chinese ruling class, which have caused in the past 20 years the continued existence of a revolutionary peasant movement, and practically guarantee it in the future. As we have said, this peasant movement has an essentially bourgeois-democratic character, even though it is led by the so-called "Communists"--the reformist Stalinists. John Hersey, writing in the July 27, 1946 NEW YORKER, gives an eye-witness account of the application of this bourgeois-democratic program to a North China village.

According to this article, the first step of the "communists" when they took this village over from the Japanese was to organize a labor union and a farmers union. Using this as their base, a village assembly was called for the purpose of "Clearing the Accounts". The nine landlords in the village were fined about \$1,000 (US) for their past practise of sending their tenants to fulfill the Japanese labor-draft instead of going themselves; he speaks further of "the landlords' habit of passing on the heavy taxes and the electric power costs on the radios they owned to the village as a whole; and the construction, at the community expense, of a kind of fortified bedroom in the crenellated tower, to which the nine landlords retired on nights when bandits were around, while the farmers stayed up to patrol the town." The money collected was doled out to the villagers.

With regard to rents: "For many years, both before the war and under the Japanese, the average rent for land was fifty per cent of the crop it produced. The Communists reduced the rents a flat twenty-five per cent of the amount previously charged, and, depending on how oppressive they considered that a particular landlord had been, they also made the reduction retroactive for anywhere between one and six years--mostly two."

With regard to taxes: "Under the Japanese, the tax rate had been sixty kilograms of millet per mow (about a quarter of an acre) and it did not matter whether the land was irrigable or dry or how much or how little land the farmer owned. The Communists introduced what they called the Reasonable-Burden Tax. In general, the most a small farmer (thirty mow or less) has to pay is about seven per cent of his crop, while a big landlord has to pay up to fifty per cent of his."

As regards land redistribution: "The Communists make much of the fact that they do not confiscate the landlords' property, that they merely reduce rents...The three main Communist economic devices for achieving a redistribution--Clearing the Accounts, rent reduction, and the sliding scale tax--accomplish the job without violence and without anyone's seeing quite how it works. Like Mr. Hai, the other landlords have had to get rid of land in order to clear their accounts. They now receive much less rent than they used to,

PN-----Page 9  
and when tax time comes around this year, they will have to lease some more land to pay up. On the other hand, almost every small farmer I talked with had picked up between two and ten mow of land this year."

As to the political structure of the regime: "There are in this area three elective levels -- the village committee, the Hsien Congress, and the Border Region Committee -- as well as a number of appointed committees, such as the District cadre, the Border Region Cabinet, and the central committee of the Party. The appointive groups do the really important work. Under the Kuomintang, villages are still organized in the old, paternalistic way: the village head dictates to heads of hundred-family units, who pass on orders to heads of ten-family units, who in turn direct the heads of the families in their group...[Under the Communists]....They have already had one election, which was to choose delegates to the Hsien Congress. At a mass meeting, which was guided by the cadre, they chose a nominating committee. This selected the candidates. All men and women over eighteen were qualified to vote -- not just family heads who had traditionally managed things. The vote was by written ballot, and illiterates were allowed to choose the people who would write for them. Crow Village elected two delegates..."

These things, together with a program for bettering agricultural production technically and regularizing the exchange of work between farmers, constitute the "Communist" program in action, as seen by a man whose previous writings have shown him to be a penetrating and socially sensitive reporter.

Certainly there is nothing socialist about this program. And the forms which are used to carry it out are reformist rather than revolutionary. It is all within the framework of the continued existence of private property. The revolutionary content lies in the fact that for twenty years the Chinese peasantry have maintained a government and an army in the field against all comers to carry this out. We have, in short, a revolutionary peasant war with a petty-bourgeois program of land reform.

Chinese Marxists have the task of organizing the seizure of power by the proletariat of the big cities and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China. The proletarian dictatorship will at one and the same time guarantee the carrying out on a country-wide scale of the petty-bourgeois land reform program of the peasants and open up the perspective of advancing beyond the framework of private property in the countryside through the collectivization and eventual socialization of agricultural production. The Chinese proletarian dictatorship can only be established through a revolutionary alliance of the peasantry with the city proletariat. And in such an alliance, the leadership must of course fall to the proletarians.

Aug. 5, 1946

## MASS MEETINGS PROTEST GA. LYNCHING

The brutal lynching of 2 Negro couples in Monroe, Georgia has been answered by a series of protest meetings on Chicago's South Side. In addition to an indoor meeting of several thousand and a meeting held by the Washington Park Open Forum, there was an open-air mass meeting of 400 workers on August 5th. The article following is based on the opening speech which evoked enthusiastic response from the workers present.

To make a really forceful protest, the holding of joint meetings in all neighborhoods, culminating in city-wide demonstrations is called for. So far the misleaders of labor have failed to do this. The mass meetings held have been confined to the South Side. The money collected has been used to send people to see the president. The case should be used to promote Negro-white working class unity and Negro-white working class action.

Malcolm and Dorsey were sharecroppers. They occupied the lowest rung of the economic ladder in the backward, inefficient system of southern agriculture. They were expected to farm the landlord's soil in return for a bare subsistence. As sharecroppers they were members of that class of slaves to money and debt which replaced the system of chattel slavery. Like the rest, they were driven by a desire to own land of their own so that they could get more than a meager living for their toil. Also like the rest, Malcolm and Dorsey were subject always to terror in the form of jim-crow, a purposeful terror designed to force the cropper tenants to stay in the South and work.

These 2 tenant farmers were apparently go-getters. They were not in debt to Harrison, their landlord. Dorsey was a veteran of both the European and Pacific campaigns and he used his veteran's checks instead of going into debt to Harrison. He and Malcolm had a bumper crop and their share was completely in the clear. Here is the tragedy of the whole situation: Had they been completely downtrodden and penniless, living like economic serfs, bound to the land by debt, and forced to suffer quietly all insults and burdens -- then, perhaps, they might still be alive today. For the cropper system sees an able and ambitious man as a threat. It cannot grant a man the right to rise by ability else its labor force would disappear.

The whole chain of events leading up to the lynching shows how carefully this event was planned to put these people in "their place." Malcolm had had a fight with a former employer -- Hester -- against whom he had defended himself with a knife. He was locked in Walton County jail by Sheriff Gordon, reportedly a relative of Hester's. Harrison, Malcolm's landlord, went to Walton taking with him Mrs. Malcolm and Mr. and Mrs. Dorsey (who worked the farm jointly with the Malcolms). He posted \$600 bond with Gordon for Malcolm's release. Gordon let Malcolm out at 5:30 PM on July 24th.

Harrison drove back with the 4 of them, taking a back road, after stalling around for 3 hours until it began to get dark. Where the road crossed a narrow wooden bridge, a mob of 20 to 30 whites armed with shotguns, pistols and knives ambushed the car. They held Harrison at gun point while they dragged Mr. Malcolm and Mr. Dorsey 50 yards off and tortured and shot them. The 2 wives recognized members of the mob and called to them by name, pleading for their hus-

PN-----11  
bands' lives. In doing so, they signed their own death warrant. A remarkable example of courage and heroism!

The mob proceeded to drag the 2 women out of the car and murder them in the same fashion as their husbands. They made a thoro job of it: Malcolm had both arms broken, shot in every possible place (including the back), a 2-inch hole in his head and deep gashes on his body. His wife, Dorothy, had the side of her face shot away, which made a hole big enough for a hand to go thru, one breast shot off, arms broken, knife-cuts and bruises. Dorsey had an ear and eye destroyed by shots, his whole body riddled with bullets and gashed by knives, arms broken. Mae Dorsey also had her arms broken and her torso full of bullets.

That this was no mere flare-up of feeling is evidenced by Harrison's statement that he thought the mobsters intended "only" to "lay a strap across their butts." In short, a conspiracy of some sort existed. Certainly Harrison is not the loser by Malcolm's and Dorsey's deaths -- he is now master of their share of the crop.

It may seem surprising that there is such a vicious struggle over so comparatively little. But this is typical of the whole status of the southern land system. Being a landlord does not necessarily mean that one is rich. Odell Waller, who was executed in Virginia for standing up for his rights, stated that his landlord was almost as poor as he was.

There was also another conspiracy. In Georgia the voting laws have been relaxed to permit Negroes and poor whites to vote. But the landlords and capitalists have no intention of granting civil rights to the working population of the South no matter how many laws are passed or repealed. This lynching was a warning to all Negroes, especially, to "keep their place." It was an answer also to all who think that the government works in the interest of the people.

To really avenge this crime perpetrated on 4 poor tenant farmers we must change the economic conditions which produce poverty and sharecropping. For the cropper system we must substitute a landholding system based on use. The fruit of the land must belong to those who work it -- both Negro and white tenant farmers. Old Jim Crow stands on landlord's land. He can't stand on any other kind. If we take the land away from the landlord, Jim Crow will come tumbling down. The Malcolms and Dorseys and their white class brothers will have an equal chance with all others. They won't have to live like serfs of old who dare not raise their heads.

Behind the landlords stand land banks, insurance companies, Wall St. Perhaps part of Malcolm and Dorsey's rent is paying the light bill for a La Salle St. office. Sharecroppers and factory workers have a common exploiter. Together they can expropriate both landlords and capitalists, socialize industry and land, give the land to those who till it. Let us here make up our minds to think this thing thru. We don't have to leave our protest to delegates. Each one of us can protest in every shop and factory and organization. And while we are organizing to protest, let us organize ourselves into a revolutionary party to overthrow the government of landlords and capitalists and put an end to the damnable jim-crow system.

# ★ R E D F R O N T ★

\* \* \* As has been remarked before, once "civilization" was brought to our 'little yellow brothers' they learned fast, but definitely fast. Why this story might have come out of any advanced American industrial conflict instead of the strike against the Japanese newspaper Yomiuri. A force of 500 company union members, spearheaded by professional musclemen obeyed the manager's order to attack and bust the striking newspapermen's union members barricaded in the press-room. This they did while dozens of policemen on the spot watched. Another company union force attacked the strike headquarters and beat up union leaders.

But in case this page chances to catch the eye of the owners of Yomiuri, we wish to give them this warning: The Japanese worker learns fast, too, so don't feel too elated over the few thousand little sheets you were able to get your strike-breaking company union to turn out. You can't divide the working class forever -- and when they all get together, brother, your turn at getting ousted is coming!

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* The Philippines: The unsolved land question is the center of the series of bloody conflicts that have racked Luzon in the last few months. Determined to resist at all costs the state-supported efforts of the large hacienda owners to keep them in practical peonage, the peasantry of central Luzon has made a desperate effort to force agrarian reforms. And the cost has been death for hundreds of members of the militant peasants' union (Hukbalahaps) in a series of engagements with bands of military police sent against them by provincial governors with the knowledge and consent of president Roxas. The policy of conciliation which he announced on taking office soon yielded under pressure of the landowners and other rightist elements to one of ruthless "wiping out of lawless elements." The armed peasants fighting for the most elementary of human rights are lawless only to capitalist law. Only when the law is made by workers of shop and soil are our human rights guaranteed.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* Germany: Unrest increases throughout the industrial Ruhr region. There isn't enough food! Food riots have been reported throughout the country. Among such reports we note where a crowd of hungry workers attacked German police and freed a black market operator. Better that they remedy their starvation level food ration by organizing to take the food directly instead of through the black market.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* Italy: Unrest is rampant and the strike wave waxes and wanes again. The contradiction between low wages and high living costs is insoluble. Turin was recently tied up in a general strike culminating in the granting of a graded scale of bonuses to all workers. Small wage increases have been won in several other large strikes some involving over 100,000 workers... But these are only drops in a bucket; the bankrupt remnants of Italian capitalism lack the resources to even temporarily bridge much of the gap between the worker's income and his living costs. And so tension is mounting again. It shouldn't take much of a push there...

\* \* \* \* \*

PN-----13  
\* \* \* We have been watching with interest during the past year the reconstitution of the Japanese Communist Party. The picture seems fairly clear now. Another reformist group has made its bow and jumped on the bandwagon.

Though labeled "red propaganda" by the conservative parties of the Diet, the draft of a constitution proposed by the Communist Party was reported "moderate in tone and content" by correspondents. The document drawn up by a committee headed by Sanzo Nasaka calls for a republican government with quadrennially elected national assembly; by and by a plebiscite on the status of the imperial family; some trust-busting, land reforms, civil rights, etc. Homage is paid in opening to the ultimate goal of a communist society. It was also dubbed "shrewd politics" by the correspondents. Perhaps shrewd politics for the politicians, but pardon us if we think the workers need something more than that.

## DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PALESTINE

We have had several heated but interesting discussion meetings on the Palestinian situation. The following is a summary of the line we advanced. Much of the warmth of the debate centered around the role of Zionism in general and labor Zionism in particular. This is a really complex problem which requires more analysis than is here contained. As soon as possible, we will devote more space to the question. We invite further discussion from any interested reader.

1. The right of self-determination for small nations and oppressed minorities is violated by world imperialism everywhere. For the essence of imperialism is precisely the oppression of the colonial masses, weaker nations and minorities for the benefit of the imperialist bourgeoisie. It is the duty of the world working class, as a part of its revolutionary struggle for the overthrow and destruction of world imperialism, to champion the right of small nations, colonial peoples and oppressed minorities to decide for themselves -- without outside compulsion or threats -- what form of government they shall have. For in so doing the international working class strikes a blow not only at imperialism, but also against the nationalist prejudices and hatreds which are kept alive among the oppressed masses by imperialist domination.
2. Likewise it is the duty of the international proletariat to fight for the right of asylum for oppressed people and for the right of free migration of workers from one country to another thruout the world.
3. For these reasons, the struggle for freedom on the part of the Jewish minority in Palestine and the demand of European Jews for the right to settle in Palestine, are not questions for the peoples of Palestine alone. They are a problem and a responsibility of the entire international working class. The interests of the working class are international. A blow struck at British imperialism in Palestine strengthens the workers thruout the British empire and all around the world. Conversely, if British or American imperialism is allowed to subdue the population of Palestine and consolidate more firmly imperialist exploitation and oppression there, the world working class

4. British imperialism, in a deal with the Arab ruling classes, plans to sacrifice the rights of the Palestinian Jews. To this end, they are carrying on an open and brutal terror campaign to disarm the Jews and crush their resistance organizations. The Jewish bourgeoisie will make a deal with British imperialism in an attempt to protect their property, rather than join with the proletariat in a struggle for independence. They will push the burdens imposed by British imperialism onto the working class as much as possible. British policy is designed to consolidate and strengthen the empire by pacifying and buying over the ruling classes of the Moslems and thus controlling the large number of Moslems in India, Egypt and the Near East. This policy is dictated, in short, by Britain's imperialist needs. The recently proposed "partition" was merely part of this strategy.

No longer, therefore, can the Zionist leaders preach the fable of a Jewish homeland protected by the British fleet. The basis for Zionist collaboration with the British, which existed during the 1920's, is narrowing. And the Jewish masses must now throw off this opiate and realize that they stand in the same position as all other workers, faced with the same enemy -- world imperialism -- of which their own bourgeoisie is a part.

5. The Arab ruling class fears the effect which the industrial development of Palestine would have on its semi-feudal land system and rights and privileges. They wish to eliminate also the base which Jewish Zionists provided for British imperialism, and thus better their bargaining position and be able to win more concessions from the British. They aim to eliminate the Jews in Palestine as a political factor and reduce the Palestine proletariat and the Jewish farmers to same economic level of oppression and exploitation as the Arab peasantry. There is no more possibility, with this Arab ruling class than there is with the British imperialists. **OF AGREEMENT**

6. If the imperialists and their allies, the Arab ruling class, have their way, the only perspective for the Jewish and Arab workers of Palestine is greatly lowered standards of living and oppressive political rule denying them all rights.

7. While we fight for the right of self-determination as a blow against imperialism, we recognize that nationalism and capitalist national states offer no freedom for the worker. We fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat in Palestine as elsewhere. We counterpose internationalism to nationalism in all its forms.

8. The simplest considerations of political and military strategy prove that only a revolutionary internationalist line of fighting for the dictatorship of the proletariat holds any hope for the workers and peasants of Palestine and the surrounding countries. Faced by both British imperialism and the Arab ruling class, as well as the treacherous Jewish capitalist class, the proletariat must win to its side the masses of oppressed Arab peasantry in the Near East. The land question is the Achilles heel of the Arab ruling class. The semi-feudal land-holding system permits a handful of effendi and muf-ti to live in luxury while the toiling masses suffer fearful exploitation and poverty. The proletariat of Palestine must raise the slo-

gan: The land to those who till it! and actively promote a peasant war against the landlords in conjunction with the revolutionary seizure of power in the cities. Such a revolutionary alliance between proletariat and peasantry, under the leadership of the proletariat, would render helpless the Arab ruling class and build a revolutionary movement that could not be put down by British imperialism or any alliance of imperialists.

9. Zionism of all shades weighs down the Palestinian proletariat like a millstone. It serves to split the working class -- Arab vs. Jew. It holds back the struggle against British imperialism. It makes impossible a revolutionary internationalist struggle of the proletariat and peasantry for power. It is the duty of revolutionary workers to make a clean break with their own bourgeoisie and its reactionary, nationalist ideology of Zionism - including the "labor" variety - which preaches national unity with the Jewish bourgeoisie. They must come out on a clear-cut internationalist line and help to found an international revolutionary Marxist organization which will lead the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

10. American imperialism, desiring a foothold in the Near East for its own predatory purposes is trying to pose as a liberal in the hope of winning the Zionist movement over to act as its catspaw. Revolutionary workers must expose this hypocrisy by confronting American imperialism with the demand for the unlimited right of asylum for Europe's oppressed. It is to be expected that the Zionist misleaders will hail U.S. imperialism as their white hope. These gentlemen and other collaborationists and opportunists of all shades would much rather join hands with U.S. imperialism than with the masses in revolutionary struggle.

11. We condemn terrorism as an ineffective means of struggle. The chemical reaction of an explosion cannot be substituted for a revolutionary mass movement. We do not, however, condemn force and violence as a weapon in the class struggle. There can be no freedom without the forceful overthrow of capitalists and imperialists. The recent attack on the British headquarters in Palestine would be a sound and legitimate action as part of a country-wide revolutionary uprising. The Zionist organizations are in the majority engaged in holding the workers back from struggle. They thus make such individualist terrorist activity inevitable. It therefore rests with the revolutionary workers whether the will to struggle will be frittered away in such individualist, useless terrorism, or whether it will be organized and led to a successful seizure of power.

Aug. 1, 1946

# # # # #

